ED 021 810 24 SP 01 583

By- Stecklein, John E.
PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM WITH A POSTDOCTORAL INTERNSHIP IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH (1966-67).
Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Bureau of Instructional Research.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, DC. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No- BR-6-2615, BR-6-2617
Pub Date- Sep 67
Grant- OEG-3-6-062171522
Note- 37p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.56
Descriptors- *COLLEGE FACULTY, *INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, *INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, ON THE JOB TRAINING, *POSTDOCTORAL EDUCATION, PROGRAM EVALUATION, SEMINARS
Identifiers- Institutional Research Council of Eleven, IRCE

A program of 9-month postdoctoral institutional research internships was sponsored by the Institutional Research Council of Eleven (IRCE)--the Big Ten and the University of Chicago. It was established to provide on-the-job experience in well-established institutional research units in selected IRCE institutions. Five carefully screened trainees became interns at the Universities of Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan State. Each director of institutional research acted as a mentor for the intern assigned to his institution. Interns participated in on-going research projects, focusing on as many aspects of institutional operation as possible e.g. academic program, personnel, students, and finances. They came together for 2 seminars, attended 4 professional meetings, and each developed 2 projects: (1) a plan for the establishment of an institutional research operation in his home institution and (2) a design for a project to be undertaken when he returned there. Mentors and interns made checklist evaluations of the program and the internship experiences; and each intern's projects were rated by the 5 mentors. Results indicated that the objectives of the program were generally realized. Included are program schedules, the evaluation checklists, and summaries of checklist responses. (JS)

BR-6-2615
and
BR-6-2617
PA-24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-2615 and 2617
Grant No. OEG 3-6-062617-1522

PA 24

PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM WITH A POSTDOCTORAL INTERNSHIP IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

September, 1967

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP001583
ED021810

PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM WITH A POSTDOCTORAL INTERNSHIP IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Project No. 6-2615 and 2617
Grant No. OEG 3-6-06217-1522

Dr. John E. Stecklein, Director

September, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Minnesota
Serving as Co-ordinating Agency
for the
Institutional Research Council of Eleven

Minneapolis, Minnesota

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements iii

Introduction 1

Characteristics of the Interns 1

Description of the Program 2

Evaluation of the Program. 12

Summary of the Interns' Evaluations 12

Summary of the Mentors' Evaluations 16

How the Mentors Rated the Interns' Projects 20

Director's Evaluation 22

Program Reports. 25

Publicity 25

Announcement. 26

Application Form. 29

Financial Summary 33

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to acknowledging the time and effort spent by the mentors, without compensation, the following individuals are deserving of special mention:

M. J. Conrad, Head of Educational Administration & Facilities Unit, The Ohio State University and Chairman of the IRCE in 1966-67, whose sustained interest in the program and reliable participation as a member of the Planning Committee, even though he was not a mentor himself, was much appreciated.

Joseph L. Saupe, Assistant Director, Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, and Chairman, IRCE, in 1965-66, deserves special mention for his excellent assistance in all stages of the project, from proposal formulation to work with interns and joint seminars.

Richard H. Elliott, Research Contracts Coordinator, University of Minnesota, is thanked for his assistance and cooperation in developing the proposal and in handling the details of distributing the funds.

Thanks go to Stanley F. Salwak, Director, Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), for his encouragement and support for the program.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Mary Corcoran, Professor, College of Education, University of Minnesota, who coordinated the process of screening the applications under heavy time pressures.

Grateful acknowledgement goes to Louis D'Amico, Associate Director, Bureau of Institutional Research, Indiana University, for his willing assistance in the initial formulation of the project proposal.

Special thanks go to Dorolese H. Wardwell and Harriett Campbell, University of Minnesota, for their continued assistance in carrying out the myriad administrative details, developing materials and communications, and general assistance in the development of the evaluation forms and the final report.

Appreciation also goes to William G. Shepherd, Vice-President for Academic Administration, University of Minnesota, for permitting the Director to divert some of his time and attention from administering institutional research at the University of Minnesota to the training of institutional research workers for other institutions.

John E. Stecklein

Introduction

With the current rapid increase in number of institutional research offices being established, plus the growing diversity in types of services they are called upon to provide, college and university administrators are being hard pressed to locate qualified and well-trained personnel to staff these units. The program here described was designed to provide postdoctoral personnel with on-the-job experience, under the supervision of recognized leaders in institutional research which would enable them to acquire a broad understanding of the nature and modes of conduct of institutional research--in short to serve as interns in research units of long practice and established reputation. It was hoped that this would provide fast feedback of trained personnel within one year's time to institutions that were desirous of developing institutional research operations.

The internship period was the academic year 1966-67 (September 16, 1966, to June 15, 1967). Five interns were selected from the applications received. All applicants had to be nominated by an administrator of a college or university, had to have an earned doctorate, had to have demonstrated some potential for institutional research, and preferably, though not necessarily, had had some experience or study in an academic discipline, and were under 51 years of age.

The applications were screened by the institutional research directors who served as mentors in the five sponsoring institutions. Assignments to specific participating institutions were made, as far as possible, in accordance with the individual intern's background and interests and the host institution's noted areas of strength in institutional research.

Characteristics of interns: The internship program was especially fortunate in being able to select interns representing a variety of types and sizes of institutions. Represented were a small liberal arts college (Luther College, Decorah, Iowa), a small state college (Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minnesota), a medium sized private university (Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana), a medium sized state university (Whitewater State University, Whitewater, Wisconsin), and a large state college (Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota). Representing these institutions were Richard Cole, Raymond Carlson, Waldemar C. Gunther, Donald H. Silva, and Dwain F. Petersen, respectively. Other characteristics of the five interns were as follows:

Experience in higher education: Average 8 years; range 2-12 years.

Doctoral origin: University of Missouri, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, University of Chicago, and University of Nebraska.

Major doctoral fields: Economics, psychology, history, biology, and education.

Average age: 35 years; range 30-48.

Position held in home institution: Academic rank: assistant professor, associate professor (2), professor, dean.

All interns were male, and all were married.

Host institutions included: The University of Illinois, Indiana University, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin. Mentors in the institutional research offices in these institutions were: Gustav J. Froehlich, Director of Institutional Research; LeRoy Hull, Director of Institutional Research; Paul Dressel, Director of Institutional Research; John E. Stecklein, Director of Institutional Research; and L. J. Lins, Coordinator of Institutional Studies, in the five institutions respectively.

Description of the Program

Salient features of the postdoctoral institutional research program included the following:[1]

1. On-the-job experience: To the extent that it was feasible, each intern participated in actual research projects currently underway, or in the design stage, focusing on as many aspects of institutional operation as possible--academic programs, personnel, students, finances, etc.

2. Conferences and joint seminars:

a. A pre-session conference was held to provide the interns with information about the nature and purpose of institutional research, and what would be expected of the interns in the internship program. All the interns and their mentors were convened in a joint session in Chicago on October 10th and 11th at the LaSalle Hotel. (See copy of program appended heretc- Exhibit A.)

Opening with a social hour and dinner meeting, the group was favored with an address by Dr. Paul Dressel, Assistant Provost Director of Institutional Research at Michigan State University. His topic was "Institutional Research." During the sessions on the following day each mentor described the organization and primary function of institutional research at his institution. Also, as further general background, Dr. M. J. Conrad, Chairman of the Institutional Research Council of Eleven, gave the background and a summary of the current activities of the Council.

---

[1]Members of the planning committee included the mentors at the five participating host institutions listed previously, plus M. J. Conrad, Chairman of the IRCE.

Exhibit A

Orientation Session
IRCE INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
La Salle Hotel

Chicago, Illinois

OCTOBER 10

6:30 p.m.: Dinner Meeting — Le Chateaubriand, Le Petite Pavillon

"Institutional Research"
Speaker, Paul L. Dressel
Assistant Provost & Director of IR
Michigan State University

OCTOBER 11

9:00 a.m.: Roundup of Institutional Research — Illini Center

Institutional Research at the University of Illinois	- G. Froehlich
Institutional Research at Indiana University	- L. Hull
Institutuional Research at Michigan State University	- J. Saupe
Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota	- J. E. Stecklein
Institutional Research at the University of Wisconsin	- L. J. Lins

11:30 a.m.: Lunch - On your own

1:15 p.m.: The IRCE
M. J. Conrad, Chairman
Institutional Research Council of Eleven

1:30 p.m.: Getting the Most Out of Your Internship Experience
John E. Stecklein

3:30 p.m.: Adjourn

b. Joint seminars. The interns were brought together for two joint seminars, were invited to participate in the two semi-annual meetings of the IRCE, and attended two professional higher education meetings during the program. The first joint seminar was held in Chicago just prior to the National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education. This meeting convened on March 5th at the Conrad Hilton Hotel. Although the presidents or their representatives of the interns' home institutions were invited to attend the seminar, only three were represented, because of schedule conflicts. (A copy of the Agenda is attached: Exhibit B.)

At this seminar the interns were required to present preliminary drafts of the first of their two required projects--the development of a proposal for the establishment of an institutional research operation in the intern's home institution, with specifications as to the functions, the mode of organization, the staffing, and possible budgetary requirements of the proposed program. These were discussed and criticized by the mentors and administrative representatives of the interns' colleges. Other features of the program were Dr. Lyman Glenny, Executive Director, State Board of Higher Education, Illinois, who spoke on "Coordination in Higher Education," and a panel on "Research in Higher Education," led by T. R. McConnell, Hugh Stickler, James Doi, Bradley Sagen, and John E. Stecklein.

The day before this seminar, the five interns met privately to exchange notes on their experiences to date. For several days after the seminar they attended the meetings of the National Conference on Higher Education. The IRCE meetings were held on November 29-30 in Chicago at the Embassy Motel, and on May 6 in Athens, Georgia, at the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Georgia. As originally planned, national and regional experts in institutional research and higher education were brought in to present papers on topics related to institutional research.

At the November meeting, Dr. Thomas R. Mason, Director of Planning and Institutional Studies at the University of Rochester, was the guest speaker. His topic was "In Search of Consequences: The Dynamics of Planning in Higher Education." During the work sessions of the Council, the interns served as working members of the committees of their choice, along with the regular representatives of the Council. (See program appended-Exhibit C.)

To minimize scheduling and travel problems, the second IRCE meeting was planned in conjunction with the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research at the University of Georgia, May 7-10. The May meeting of the Council and the joint seminar were held on May 6-7 at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education.

Exhibit B

Agenda for Joint Seminar
IRCE POSTDOCTORAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
Conrad Hilton Hotel, Parlor 523
March 5, 1967

9:00 a.m.	Welcome and Introductions - John E. Stecklein
9:05 a.m. - 12:30	Presentation of suggested institutional research organization and operation at home institutions of interns, with discussion by presidents and mentors.

1. Presentation by Dr. Donald H. Silva, Whitewater State College, Whitewater, Wisconsin.
2. Presentation by Dr. Dwain E. Peterson, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota.
3. Presentation by Dr. Waldemar C. Gunther, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana.
4. Presentation by Dr. Raymond P. Carlson, Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minnesota.
5. Presentation by Dr. Richard G. Cole, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

12:30 - 1:30 p.m.	Dutch Treat Luncheon
1:30 p.m.	"Coordination in Higher Education." Dr. Lyman Glenny, Executive Director, State Board of Higher Education, Illinois.
3:00 p.m.	"Research in Higher Education: Past, Present, and Future." Dr. T. R. McConnell, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley.
4:30 p.m.	End of Seminar
5:00 - 7:00 p.m.	Dinner Meeting of Internship Planning Committee

Exhibit C

Program
FALL MEETING OF IRCE - NOVEMBER 29-30, 1966
Embassy Hotel - O'Hare Airport
Chicago, Illinois

November 29

10:00-11:45 a.m. FIRST GENERAL SESSION

10:00-11:15 Introduction of Interns* and Other New Members

Reports of I.R.C.E. Committees and Activities

The Steering Committee -- W. J. Conrad

The Postdoctoral Internship Program -- John Stecklein

Fact Book Committee -- Joe Saupe

The Workshop Committee -- Lee Hall

Faculty Load Committee -- David Otto

Questionnaire Committee -- Joe Lins

11:15-11:45 Organization Sessions of Existing or New Committees

11:45- 1:00 p.m. LUNCH (On your own)

1:00- 3:30 SECOND GENERAL SESSION

1:00- 1:45 Problems and Forces Leading to the Development of an Institutional Research Office -- Jeremy Wilson

Group Discussion

1:45- 3:30 Innovative Practices at Home

- Grading Practices and Mathematical Models -- Lee Hall

- Accounting and Allocation of Fees Remitted to Graduate Students -- Ed Wiet

*Each intern was invited to serve as a working member with the Committee of his choice.

Innovative Practices at Home (continued)

- Analysis of Staff Assignments -- Harry Hirschl
- Student Attendance Patterns and Academic Budgeting -- Joe Saupe
- Motivating Environment of the Academic Staff -- Paul Hertins
- Variables Associated with College Retention -- David Otto
- New Procedures for Collecting Statistical Data and State-Wide Cost Studies -- Gus Froehlich
- Survey of Examination Practices and Philosophy -- John Stecklein
- Simulation Procedures in Planning for Transfer of Selected Instructional Programs to a Satellite Campus -- Ross Armstrong
- Automated Registration Procedures Using Optical Scanning Equipment -- George Baughman
- Staff Time Utilization -- Joe Line

3:30- 5:30 p.m. THIRD GENERAL SESSION

General Work Sessions of the Various Committees Organized in the Morning Session

6:00 DINNER and OPEN EVENING

Dinner -- Dutch Treat Group Dinner

Entertainment (On your own)

Special Committee Meetings
(Some committees may want to get together for an extra session after dinner)

November 30

9:00-11:30 a.m. FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

9:00-10:30 "The Role of Institutional Research in Future Planning" -- Tom Mason, Director of Institutional Planning, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York

General Discussion

10:30-11:30 Critique of the Pack of Forms from the U.S. Office of Education -- Lee Hull

11:30- 1:00 p.m. LUNCH (On your own)

1:00- 2:30 FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

I.R.C.E. Business Meeting

Continuation of Freshman Matriculant Study? -- Lee Hull

Informal Participation of Other Schools -- Joe Lins

Definitions -- John Stecklein

New Projects or Directions for IRCE

Looking Ahead to the Spring Meeting
Program Suggestions
Location for Spring Meeting

Opening with a General Session on Saturday, May 6, reports from the various committees were presented. There was discussion of the possible higher education appropriations in the home states of the Council members, followed by work sessions of the various committees. Again, the interns joined the committees of their choice.

At the Sunday morning session each intern presented his plan for a proposed study to be conducted at his home institution. These proposals were reviewed and commented upon critically by the Council members, as well as by the mentors and other interns.

Two speakers were invited to address the group. Dr. Bonifacio Pilapil of the Bureau of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota spoke on "Management Aspects of Higher Education in the Philippines," noting sharp contrasts to American procedures. Dr. Robert N. Willis, Director of Academic Research and Planning, Florida State University, was the guest lecturer at the afternoon session. His topic was "Budgetary Analyses." (A copy of the program for the May meeting is appended hereto-Exhibit D.)

c. Professional meetings. As indicated previously, expenses were paid for the interns to attend meetings of the National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, and to the National Forum On Institutional Research by the Association for Institutional Research. Two of the interns also attended the American Educational Research Association meeting in New York City in February.

3. Special projects: The two projects required of each intern have been mentioned earlier--the development of a proposal for the establishment of an institutional research operation in the intern's home institution, and the development of a plan for a specific research study to be conducted in the intern's home institution.

4. Formal course work: No course work was taken by interns except an occasional audit of a course.

Shortly after the Internship Program got into operation, the planning committee decided that additional contact with the interns' home institutions would be helpful both to the mentors and the interns. With this in mind, plans were made for each mentor to visit his intern's home institution prior to the first joint seminar in March, to learn more about the institution and the president's plan for Institutional Research. Because one president was killed and a second resigned, only three visits were made, but they proved conclusively the value of such visits.

Exhibit D

IRCE SPRING MEETING AND JOINT SEMINAR FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH INTERNS
Georgia Center for Continuing Education
University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

May 6-7, 1967

SATURDAY, MAY 6

2:00 - 3:30 GENERAL SESSION

2:00 - 2:45 Introduction of New Members

Brief Reports of Committees and IRCE Activities

Steering Committee - M. J. Conrad

Postdoctoral Internship Program - John Stecklein

Fact Book Committee - Joe Saupe

Faculty Load Committee - David Otto

Questionnaire Committee - Joe Lins

Summer Workshop Proposal - John Stecklein

2:45 - 3:15 Innovative Practices and Projects

Projecting Building Space Requirements for Regional Campus - Harry Hirschl, Purdue

Graduate Education Data - Joe Saupe, Michigan State

3:15 - 3:30 Outlook for Appropriations for Higher Education Back Home - Round Robin Review

3:30 - 5:30 GENERAL WORK SESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS COMMITTEES

SUNDAY, MAY 7

8:30 - 11:00 JOINT SEMINAR
Reports of Postdoctoral Interns in Institutional Research

Donald H. Silva, Associate Professor of Economics, Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wisconsin
Host Institution: Indiana University, Bloomington
"Studies for 1967 Summer Session at Wisconsin State University"

Dwain F. Petersen, Associate Professor, Psychology and Educational Psychology, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota
Host Institution: Michigan State University, E. Lansing
"Planning and Management Data for Mankato State College"

Waldemar C. Gunther, Professor of Biology and Director of Research, Valparaiso, Indiana
Host Institution: University of Minnesota
"Faculty Load and Course Proliferation Study"

Richard G. Cole, Assistant Professor of History, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa
Host Institution: University of Wisconsin
"Institutional Analysis at Luther College 1967-68"

Raymond P. Carlson, Dean of Students, Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minnesota
Host Institution: University of Illinois
"An Analysis of Institutional Costs by Function and the Derivation of a Unit Cost"

11:00 - 11:30 GUEST LECTURER
"Management Aspects of Higher Education in the Philippines"
Dr. Bonifacio Pilapil, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota

1:00 - 3:00 GUEST LECTURER
"Budgetary Analysis" - Robert N. Willis, Director Academic Research and Planning, Florida State University

Group Discussion

3:00 - 5:00 BUSINESS SESSION

Elections
Whither IRCE
Looking Ahead to the Fall Meeting
Program Suggestions
Location of Fall Meeting

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation of the internship program was undertaken in two ways: the individual interns were evaluated by their respective mentors at about the mid-point of the program, with a report going back to the President of the institution, and again at the end of the program, with a second report being returned to the home institution of each intern. In addition, the interns were asked to evaluate all phases of the program, using both a check-list and an open-end questionnaire. The mentors, too, were asked to evaluate the internship program, in its many aspects.

Interns' Evaluations

Each intern was asked to complete the two check-lists shown on pages 12c and 13 to provide an over-all appraisal of the several meetings planned as part of the internship experience, the procedures that were involved, and the individual kinds of internship experiences that they may or may not have experienced.

Of the 14 items listed on the planned meetings check-list, which included both over-all impressions of the meetings and special lectures or presentations included in the meetings, three--the orientation session, the presentation by Paul Dressel, and the presentation by Lyman Glenny--received ratings of good or very good by at least four of the five interns. (The two presentations were also rated as very good by four of the five mentors.) All of the remaining meetings or individual presentations were rated as fair or good by at least four of the five interns. One intern rated the A.H.E. conference very poor, another rated the second IRCE meeting as poor, and a third intern rated the interns' presentations at the second seminar as poor.

It could be argued that the over-all ratings reflect a "Halo" effect, but the general impression is that the interns were generally satisfied with the kinds of meetings and speakers to which they were exposed. (When the mentors were asked to complete the same check-list [page 16], their over-all reactions coincided very well with those of the interns, although there was no exact duplication of mentor's and intern's paired responses in more than one or two instances.)

Reactions to procedures followed throughout the internship program were generally favorable, with four of the ten procedures listed given ratings of good or very good by at least four of the five interns, and only one procedure receiving a rating of poor or very poor by as many as two interns. The procedure criticized most

by the interns was the explanation of the nature of the internship experience, where two gave an evaluation of poor and one of very poor. It is interesting to note that none of the five mentors rated the explanation of the nature of the internship experience less than good on the scale. It appears that the explanation of the nature of the internship experience was not clear or it was not consistent with the later experiences of three of the interns. This provides useful information if a subsequent program of this type is developed, because if anything should be clear in the development of a program of this type, it should be the explanation of what will be expected of the interns and to what kind of experiences they will be exposed.

Internship Experiences

The numbers in the cells to the left of the Experience Check-list (page 13) show the number of interns who indicated whether or not they had had each experience listed. The pattern speaks for itself, showing both a variety of experiences for the individual interns, as well as a substantial communality of experiences. At least four of the five had had some experience in designing a study, in searching the literature for information about a special project, in doing general reading about institutional research, in using computer programming, in interpreting data and sitting in committee meetings with mentor or staff, in visiting other units on campus, in making budgetary analyses, prediction studies, faculty studies, and curriculum studies. In three areas four of the five interns did not have any experience during their nine-month internship. These areas were working in other units on campus, presenting research findings, and supervising research assistants or clerks.

It is interesting to note, however, that when the mentors were asked to indicate which kinds of experiences their interns had received, there was agreement between mentors and interns on only one of the previously mentioned omitted experiences--the experience of working in other units on campus. On the other two, only two of the mentors agreed with the interns that they had not had the experiences listed. A comparison of the mentors' responses to the Experience Check-list (page 17) with the interns' responses (page 13) indicates the extent to which the mentors believe that the interns had more experiences than the interns themselves recalled. In about nine out of ten cases where the interns indicated that they had had no experience in a particular area, the mentors disagreed and indicated that the interns had had experience. This difference in recollection may represent faulty memory on either part, or a difference in views of a particular activity, but it suggests that if the mentors were correct, the experience was not impressionable enough to be recalled.

The impressions as to whether the frequency of the experiences given the interns was too much, about right, or too little are shown in the right-hand half of the check-list on page 13 for the interns and page 17 for the mentors. Here there seems to be better agreement between the interns and the mentors, with the vast majority of the responses centering on the "about right" category. At least three out of five of the interns believed that they had had too little experience in criticizing research designs and in curriculum studies. Mentors, on the other hand, indicated almost unanimously that the interns had had too little experience in space studies. Another interpretation of these responses suggests that the interns were left too much to themselves to do free reading about institutional research, with two of the five interns suggesting that they had had too much of this type of activity.

Evaluation of the Program

Summaries of the interns' and mentors' evaluations of the program and personnel are indicated on the check lists attached. Their answers to the open-ended questions have also been summarized for the overall program. The program director's evaluation comprise the remainder of this section.

Summary of Interns' Evaluations

The x's in the boxes at the right represent the appraisal of the interns of the various aspects of the internship program:

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Planned Meetings					
Orientation Session			x	xxx	x
Paul Dressel ("Institutional Research")				xxx	x
First IRCE Meeting			xxx	xx	
Thomas Mason ("Planning and IR")			xx	xx	
First Joint Seminar			xx	xx	
Interns' Presentations			xxxx	x	
Lyman Glenny ("Coord. of Higher Education")			x	xxx	
The AHE Conference	x		xx	xx	
Second IRCE Meeting		x	xx	xx	
Second Joint Seminar			xxx	x	
Interns' Presentations		x	xx	x	x
Bonifacio Pilapil ("Higher Education in the Philippines")			xx	xx	x
Robert N. Willis ("Budgetary Analysis")			xx	xx	
AIR Forum		xx		x	xx
Comment:					
Procedures					
Explanation of the Nature of the Internship Experience	x	xx		x	x
Explanation of Interns' Assignments		x		xxx	
Notification About Meetings				xx	xxx
Opportunity to Get to Know Other Interns			xx	x	xx
Opportunity to Get to Know Own Mentor			xx	x	xx
Opportunity to Get to Know Other Mentors	x		xx	x	x
Promptness of Payment of Stipend			x	x	xxx
Promptness of Reimbursement of Expenses			x		xxxx
Application Form				x	xxxx
Application Procedures		x	x	x	xx
Other					
Comment:					

Summary of Interns' Evaluations of Their Experiences

Experience

The x's in the boxes below denote the responses from the five interns indicating whether or not they have had the listed internship experiences and whether they believe there was too much, too little, or about the right amount of such experiences:

Had Experience?		Internship Experiences (Other Than for Project for Home Institution)	Frequency		
Yes	No		Too Much	About Right	Too Little
xxxx	x	Opportunity to design a study		xxx	x
xxx	xx	Designing a questionnaire or survey form		xxx	
xxx	xx	Coding data or setting up codes	x	x	xx
xx	xxx	Tabulating data	x	x	x
xxxxx		Literature search for special project	xx	xxx	
xxxxx		General reading about IR	xxx	xx	
xxxx	x	Use of computer programming		xxx	xx
xx	xxx	Use of other automated equipment		xxx	x
xxx	xx	Analysis of data	x	xx	x
xxx	xx	Making tables, graphs, etc.	x	xx	
xxxx	x	Interpreting data	x	xx	x
xx	xxx	Writing reports of study findings		xxx	
xxxx	x	Sitting in on campus committee meetings with mentor or IR staff		xxxx	
xxxx	x	Visiting other units on campus		xx	xx
x	xxxx	Working in other units on campus		x	xx
x	xxxx	Presenting research findings		xx	x
x	xxxx	Supervising research assistants or clerks		xx	
xx	xxx	Criticizing research designs			xxx
xx	xxx	Criticizing research reports		x	xx
xxxxx		Budgetary analysis	x	xx	xx
xxxx	x	Prediction studies	x	xx	x
xxxxx		Faculty studies	x	xxxx	
xxx	xx	Space studies		xx	xx
xxxx	x	Curriculum studies		x	xxx
xx	xxx	Facilities planning		xx	xx
x		Other		x	

SUMMARY OF INTERNS' RESPONSES

1. In what way(s) did your internship experience differ from what you had expected it would be?

Three of five interns expected a more structured experience than they found. One anticipated more work in educational research, and another thought the program should have provided more computer experience. The operational level was lower for one intern than he had expected.

2. Do you believe the two projects assigned to you (organizational plan for IR in home institution and design of special project to be conducted in home institution) were worthwhile activities? Why?

All the interns considered their projects worthwhile, although two said their own institutions were not especially concerned with institutional research. Most interns felt the projects were of value in providing both background and incentive for institutional research. Two interns were convinced that the projects gave them better insight into institutional research.

3. Please state what you consider to be the major strengths or best features of your internship experience, if any:

All the interns said they had ample opportunity to learn at first hand about institutional research. In addition, one appreciated the chance for unlimited reading, another enjoyed the personal contact with eminent persons in the field, and a third intern said he gained understanding of higher education from the program. Two interns mentioned the practical value of actual participation in institutional research functions.

4. Please indicate what you consider to be the major weaknesses or worst features of your experience as an intern, if any:

Three interns felt that there was not enough advanced planning by the host institutions, and, along the same line, one said his operational level was not made clear to him. Another felt that responsibility for directing his activities was not clearly defined. One out of five interns did not have a visit to his home institution--a fact that he regretted. Visits to committee meetings and contact with other "administrative interns" would have been helpful to one of the men, and he would also have liked more participation in projects at the host institution.

5. Of all your IR experiences this year, which one or two do you think will be of greatest benefit to your institution?

The two features considered most valuable by the interns were the institutional research resources placed at their disposal and the initiating of plans for an IR office in their home institutions.

Special projects were also rated as a valuable experience. One intern found gathering of data for decision making as being most helpful while the development of a cost analysis system for both home and state systems appealed to another. Opportunity for reading was highly rated by two interns. Only one out of the five doubted that his home institution would cooperate in establishing an institutional research program.

6. In what way do you think your mentor was most helpful to you?

Only one intern did not respond to this question. Helpful qualities supplied by the mentors included involving the intern in institutional research activities, making available staff and university resources, and providing constructive criticism and personal help.

7. In what way do you think your mentor was least helpful to you?

One intern did not respond and another said he had nothing specific to report. Failure to give him a complete overview of activities and lack of encouragement to participate in functions of other university offices practicing institutional research were mentioned by one. Another intern expressed disappointment because his mentor had turned down his proposal for a total institutional research project at the host institution. Complete enthusiasm was registered by one participant who replied, "In no way, unless he had worked me harder."

8. Please indicate in what way your mentor could have done more to improve your experience:

Two interns said, "by more contacts outside the department." One would have liked direction by someone with a base heavy schedule, and another favored more direct involvement in institutional research problems. And, again, one intern felt that his mentor had done everything possible for him.

9. What would you suggest to improve the internship program?

Two cited need for work in smaller colleges where institutional research would be on a different scale and consequently more similar to his home institution. Two interns felt that the program should be shortened, intensified, and more structured. One suggested that interns should be allowed to choose the host institution.

10. Other Suggestions:

Only three interns replied in this area. One suggested that the interns' comments should be made available to all mentors as well as to the host institutions. Two interns again mentioned the worthwhile quality of their experiences and the awareness it gave them of the need for institutional research.

Summary of Instructors' Evaluations of the Program

The [illegible] in the boxes on the right indicate the instructors' appreciation of the various aspects of the internship program:

Planned Meetings	Many Days	Days	Hours	Once	Many Once
Orientation Session				[illegible]	
Mid-Semester ("Evaluation") Research[1]					
First IEP Meeting				[illegible]	
Intern Work ("Planning and IEP")				[illegible]	
First Visit Seminar				[illegible]	
Interns' Presentations					
Open Diary ("Invest. of Higher Education")				[illegible]	
Mid-IEP Conference			[illegible]	[illegible]	
Second IEP Meeting			[illegible]	[illegible]	
Second Visit Seminar				[illegible]	
Interns' Presentations				[illegible]	
Continuing Project ("Higher Education in the Curriculum")			[illegible]	[illegible]	
School Bd. Review ("Budgetary Analysis")		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
IEP Forms				[illegible]	[illegible]
Comments:					

Discussions				
Implications of the Future of the Internship Experience			[illegible]	[illegible]
Implications of Interns' Assignments	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
Curriculum Vitae Meetings			[illegible]	[illegible]
Opportunity to Get to Know Other Interns		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Opportunity to Get to Know the Mentor		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Opportunity to Get to Know Other Mentors	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Evaluations of Methods of Project			[illegible]	[illegible]
Evaluations of Dissemination of Outcomes	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
Application Form		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Application Procedures		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other				
Comments:				

Summary of Mentors' Evaluations of Interns' Experiences

Instructions

The x's in the boxes below denote the responses from the mentors indicating which internship experiences were offered the interns, and whether the mentors believe there was too much, too little, or about the right amount of such experiences for the interns:

Had Experience?		Internship Experiences (Other than for Project for Home Institution)	Frequency		
Yes	No		Too Much	About Right	Too Little
xxxxx		Opportunity to design a study		xxxx	x
xxxxx		Designing a questionnaire or survey form		xxx	xx
xxxx	x	Coding data or setting up codes		xxxx	x
xxx	xx	Tabulating data	x	xxx	
x x x		Literature search for special project		xxxxx	
x x		General reading about IR	x	xxx	x
xx	xxx	Use of computer programming		x	xx
x	xxxx	Use of other automated equipment		xxx	x
x x x		Analysis of data		xxxx	x
xxxx	x	Making tables, graphs, etc.		xx	xx
xxxxx		Interpreting data		xxx	xx
xxxx	x	Writing reports of study findings		xx	xx
x x x		Sitting in on campus committee meetings with mentor or IR staff		xxx	xx
xxxx		Visiting other units on campus		xxxxx	
x	x x x	Working in other units on campus		xxx	x
x x	xx	Presenting research findings		xx	xx
xx	x x	Supervising research assistants or clerks		xxx	x
xxxx		Initiating research designs		xxxx	
xxxx		Initiating research reports		xxxx	
x x	xx	Budgetary analysis		xxx	x
xxxx	x	Simulation studies		xx	xx
xxxx		Faculty studies	x	xxx	x
xx	xxx	Space studies		x	xxx
x x	x	Curriculum studies		xxx	
xx	x x	Facilities planning		xxx	x
x		Other		x	

SUMMARY OF MENTORS' RESPONSES

1. What features of the internship program do you feel were most worthwhile?

Mentors indicated that all features as planned were worthwhile, but some did not work out as well as others. Items cited for special praise included flexibility of the program, opportunity for outside speakers and exchange of ideas, collaboration on local projects at the host institution, orientation sessions at which mentors and interns participated, and projects required of the interns. Three mentors gave special mention to the visits to the intern's home institution as being helpful in structuring the program to individual needs. Two thought that the opportunity to review literature was important, while one mentor recommended the chance to audit courses and to do research in a special field of interest. The opportunity to learn about the problems of institutional research from the vast resources of a large university, and then to apply that knowledge to the less complex situation of a smaller institution, was mentioned by one mentor as a most desirable feature, although he added that much would depend on the intern's ability to perform this task.

2. What features of the internship program do you feel were least worthwhile?

Here, again, the mentors pointed out that there were no completely worthless features in the program, it was just that some were more readily carried out. Lack of sufficient time to spend with the intern was indicated by two mentors, while another expressed disappointment in the presentations made by the interns. One out of five believed there was probably a lack of readiness for institutional research in institutions and an insufficient number of candidates for a proper selection.

Paying the intern's full salary from the grant was deplored by one mentor, who also mentioned the necessity of getting to know the intern well, convincing him that the program was sound, and providing the intern with more opportunities to work with others.

3. What would you suggest to improve the program if it were continued?

Three mentors suggested earlier and perhaps longer visits by the mentor to the intern's home institution, one thought this might even be part of the screening process; a second mentor believed it would help to ascertain definite needs at the home institution; and a third recommended a follow-up visit which would include the intern. A two-week workshop as a part of the internship program was offered as another suggestion. Two mentors favored a more selective recruitment program, probably through earlier funding, which would also lead to more effective program planning.

One mentor urged a more formal program of experiences for interns with emphasis on methodologies and procedures, while another proposed a structured guideline for mentors with a checklist of proposed intern activities. Belief that there should be stronger interest in IR evinced by both the prospective intern and his institution was the opinion of one mentor.

And, finally, only one out of five said he would make no change in the program, providing he had the same type of intern.

4. Did your intern appear to be sincerely motivated to learn as much as possible about IR?

Three mentors out of five responded with an emphatic affirmative; one said his intern was apprehensive about leaving his main area of professional interest and taking the internship when there were administrative changes occurring at his home institution. One mentor felt his intern had not understood the implications of accepting the internship, and the duties and obligations involved.

5. How well did your intern carry out tasks assigned or suggested to him?

Two mentors gave definite approval to their interns handling of tasks; one said his candidate did "farily well", and one considered his intern strongly motivated but poorly prepared at first, a condition later rectified by the program. One mentor reported that his intern performed tasks very superficially or not at all and that the intern had indicated that he felt the assignments were beneath him.

6. Did your intern seek out projects, contacts, or readings on his own initiative?

Four mentors responded affirmatively, although one of them said he "opened some doors first." One mentor said he was not aware that any such efforts were made by his intern.

7. What kinds of problems (if any) did you have with your intern?

Four mentors reported no problems, with the qualification by one whose intern was slow in starting but who rapidly gained momentum. Of this same group, one mentor regretted that time and his own initiative prevented the intern from working on more office projects.

One mentor considered his intern somewhat recalcitrant, whose repeated absences and lack of cooperation made the internship less fruitful than it might have been.

8. Did you visit your intern's institution in your capacity as mentor? If so, do you feel that it was a worthwhile activity?

Three out of five mentors reported that they visited their interns' home institutions and all thought the visits valuable, especially in gearing the interns' experiences to their college situations. One of these mentors regretted that his visit had, of necessity, been very late in the year.

Two mentors reported that they could not visit the institutions because of adverse administrative situations, such as the death of the president (a visit will be made later), and other personnel changes.

9. How would you appraise your intern's potential for directing and/or conducting institutional studies in his home institution or elsewhere?

Four reported their interns had "good" potential abilities for institutional research studies; one mentor qualified this rating in case the intern had a job with major responsibility. Only one mentor considered his intern unsuited to conduct or direct IR studies in either his home institution or elsewhere.

10. The x's in the boxes below indicate the ratings made by the five mentors of the general quality of the projects presented by each of the interns:

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Intern No. 1					
Plan for organizing IR in home institution				xx	xxx
Research projects for home institution					xxxxx
Intern No. 3					
Plan for organizing IR in home institution		xx	x	xx	
Research projects for home institution		x	xxx	x	
Intern No. 5					
Plan for organizing IR in home institution	xx	x	xx		
Research projects for home institution		xx	xxx		
Intern No. 4					
Plan for organizing IR in home institution				xxxx	x
Research projects for home institution				xxxx	x
Intern No. 2					
Plan for organizing IR in home institution		x	xx	xx	
Research projects for home institution		x	xx	x	x

11. Would you recommend your intern for a job in IR? Would you qualify your recommendation in any way?

Doubt about his intern's potential for institutional research work and the possibility of recommending him for a job in IR were expressed by only one mentor. At the other extreme, only one mentor recommended his intern without reservations. The other mentors would recommend their interns if: he was more committed to IR than he appeared to be and would be more "applied-research conscious"; the job was not one with major responsibility in a major institution; he obtains some experience before undertaking a job in a large institution.

Director's Evaluation

1. After one year's experience with the Post Doctoral Trainee Project, it is my distinct impression that the objectives of the program were sound and well-considered, and that they were for the most part realized, if the individual intern was adequately motivated to perform in the internship experience as expected. The nature of the experiences, especially the required projects--developing a program proposal for an institutional research operation in his home institution, and sketching out the design of a study that would be of use to the home institution--were especially valuable as training tools. Probably a little more structure would be wise in developing a subsequent program of this type, to guide the mentors in the separate institutions. The innovation of a mentor's visit to the home institution of the intern was found to be most useful when made early in the internship experience, and should probably be considered as one of the means of screening applicants for any subsequent programs, if time permits. In other words, funds should be made available to permit prospective mentors to visit the president of the home institution and to learn more about the institution and the proposed intern before he is admitted to the program. The one instance of bad selection in this project might have been eliminated if such a visit had been possible. The joint seminars seemed to be effective and well-attended, and the interchange of ideas among the mentors and interns was especially helpful. The invited speakers did not all perform as well as hoped, but the subjects of their talks were of interest to both interns and mentors.

It would seem that the allocation of 10 per cent of the mentors time to supervise the interns was inadequate, and if better supervision of the intern is to be accomplished. this percentage time should be boosted to 20 or 25 per cent. This might put more responsibility on the mentor, and compensation for such a large amount of time should be built into the budgetary structure. As indicated in the evaluation forms sent in by the mentors, several thought that they had not been able to devote as much time as would be desirable. Whether a budgetary commitment would cause them to have greater concern for finding the time to spend with the interns is a moot question, of course, but when no funds were available to cover their time, there was not the dedication that I had hoped for on the part of one or two mentors.

In general the selection criteria for the trainees seemed to be adequate, although one might question the true intent of a couple of the college presidents in recommending the interns who were accepted. Steps should be taken to try to determine with a greater degree of conviction the real interest of the intern in Institutional Research as a possible subsequent occupational endeavor, and the true attitude of the college president toward Institutional Research as a new operation on

his campus. I would also recommend that the amount of funds made available for moving the household belongings of the interns be cut to a bare minimum, because there is great inequity in the amounts made available, depending upon the desire of the intern. An intern should not expect to move all of his furniture for a nine-months stay; he should expect to store his belongings and rent facilities or otherwise pay his own expenses. While I fought for additional funds to make it possible to move the belongings of the interns, I have now decided that this was an unreasonable expectation and the amount of replacement funds should be limited to actual travel expenses of the intern and his family for one round trip.

Because of the limited time available, and the limited amount of funds, the internship program could not be extended beyond the midwestern area. If a subsequent program was offered, it would be highly desirable to make it available to anyone in the United States, and hopefully have a large enough class to be able to have representatives from all parts of the country. Such a wide scale program would provide much larger quick feed-back in this area of critically short trained personnel.

The organization, timing and length of program seemed to be adequate. A couple of interns said that the time might be shortened, but those who made that suggestion were individuals who demonstrated superficial motivation and interest in the experience, and I would not pay their suggestion much heed. I would emphasize the need for a full nine-month program in order to cover adequately the many phases of Institutional Research.

The budget, in general, was adequate, except for the allowance made for arranging for facilities for joint seminars and special meetings. The original budget should have included support for an administrative assistant to the director, and the later revision to cover some of the expenses of such a person was welcome and well-spent. For small groups, such as we had, it was almost impossible to obtain meeting rooms free of charge in hotels or motels. Also the reluctance of the United States Office Of Education to provide funds for long distance telephone conversations, particularly in a co-operative endeavor of this type, seemed to be short-sighted.

2. The major strength of the program, I believe, was the setting for the internships. Five major, well-established offices of Institutional Research put their entire resources at the disposal of five individuals who indicated an interest in learning more about this occupational field and how it might be applied to their home institutions. Additional features of the program that were of greatest value were the development of a plan for organizing institutional research in their home institutions, and a project that could be carried out when they returned. These provided immediate feed-back value to the home institution, and

permitted the interns to develop these projects under the guidance of experienced institutional research people. Other major strengths of the program were identified by the mentors and interns in the evaluation section that precedes.

3. The major weakness of the program was the lack of real motivation on the part of one or two interns. A lesser weakness was the lack of structure to coordinate activities of the separate mentors. This lack of structure was deliberate, in the belief that each mentor would be able to adjust his program to fit the needs of his individual intern, and no specific program should be prescribed for all interns. After this year's experience, it would seem that a certain basic prescription of experiences should be developed, but a certain amount of flexibility should be retained, in order to accommodate the individual abilities and interests of the interns.

4. My over-all evaluation of the program is favorable, and the replies of the interns and mentors on the checklist shown previously seem to support this conclusion. I believe that although we had a very unhappy experience with one intern, it is just as useful to find out that a person is not suited to a particular kind of occupational activity as to find out that he is suited. Finding this out in a program of this type saved both the individual and an institution that might hire him to perform this kind of activity from embarrassment and loss of time and resources. I believe that the idea was sound and that the program set up to implement the idea was basically sound. I am grieved that the Educational Research Training Program has terminated its support of programs of this type because the nature of institutional research is such that it simply is not widely enough known or well enough established to compete effectively in the open market with other kinds of training of educational researchers. Too many people do not know about this occupational activity and do not know how to go about applying for individual post-doctoral internships, even if they do. The best approach, therefore, would seem to be a programmatic one, wherein the notification of the opportunity, the planning and conduct of the program, and the selection of the applicants is contained in one sphere of operation. I am also sorry that all that I and the mentors learned this year in conducting a program of this type will now be laid aside because of the lack of opportunity to carry on additional training programs of this type.

5. My summary of recommendations to improve the U.S.O.E. administration of the Educational Research Training Program would include the following points: (a) Re-establish the support for programs for training Educational Researchers that have shown reliable, effective, and sound design and operation. (b) Provide greater flexibility in the use of funds for renting facilities needed in co-operative ventures. (c) Earlier notification of the approval of a grant in order to allow adequate preparation and solicitation of applications.

Program Reports

1. Publicity

Because approval of the grant was not definite until June 15, and the program was to begin September 15, initial notification of the program was handled by direct telephone contact between members of the planning committee and presidents in the midwest area and by a four-page, preliminary mimeographed announcement and application form sent by each committee member to all colleges and universities in his state about June 1. (See copy attached). This procedure had been agreed upon at an earlier meeting of the IRCE. Additional inquiries were received by the Bureau of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota as the news spread. A general news release went out from the University of Minnesota News Service, dated October 24, 1966 (copy attached). Additional publicity included a mention of the program in the AERA newsletter, and a journal article now in preparation.

2. Application Summary

a. Approximate number of inquiries from prospective trainees (letter or conversation) 25

b. Number of completed applications received 13

c. Number of first rank applications (Applicants who were well-qualified whether or not they were offered admission) 7

d. How many applicants were offered admission? 5

3. Trainee Summary

a. Number of trainees initially accepted in program 5

Number of trainees enrolled at the beginning of program 5

Number of trainees who completed program 5

b. Categorization of trainees

(1) Number of trainees who principally are elementary or secondary public school teachers _____

(2) Number of trainees who are principally local public school administrators or supervisors ____

(3) Number of trainees from colleges or universities, junior colleges, research bureau, etc. (specify)
2 colleges
3 universities

A N N O U N C E M E N T

POSTDOCTORAL INTERNSHIP IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Sponsored by the
Institutional Research Council of Eleven

What: The Institutional Research Council of Eleven (IRCE)[1] has been awarded a Grant by the U.S. Office of Education to conduct a postdoctoral training program for six interns in institutional research for the 1966-67 academic year. The purpose of the program is to enable institutions of higher learning to acquire in a relatively short period of time trained personnel for institutional research responsibilities.

Who: Institutions of higher education (within the seven-state area of IRCE--Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) are invited to recommend individuals on their staffs who have just recently been given or will soon be given responsibility for institutional research functions. Persons recommended, in addition to being assigned direct responsibility for institutional research in their home institution, should have the following qualifications:

1. Possess an earned doctorate.

2. Have potential in institutional research and preferably, though not necessarily, some experience, study, or research in an academic discipline.

3. Be under 51 years of age.

How: Applications must be submitted by July 1, to permit review by the IRCE Selection Committee. In addition to the personal and professional information requested on the application form, a statement must be submitted by the applicant's administrative superior (the president, vice-president, academic dean, etc.), indicating (a) his purpose in setting up an institutional research activity, and (b) his reasons for assigning the institutional research activity to the applicant.

---

[1] The Institutional Research Council of Eleven is an informal organization of institutional research officers, or their counterparts, in the following universities: University of Chicago, University of Illinois, University of Indiana, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Purdue University, and the University of Wisconsin.

When: The internships will run from September 15, 1966, through June 15, 1967.

Where: At the outset, institutional research units at the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Illinois, Michigan State University, and Indiana University will serve as training units for the internship program in institutional research. Each of the institutions mentioned above will serve as the host for one intern during the 1966-67 academic year. Assignment of interns to the various institutions will be made by the Selection Committee, but preferences may be expressed.

The Program: The internship program will consist of the following:

1. In-Service Research Experience--The intern will be given experience in a variety of research areas including academic programs, personnel, students, finance, administration, legislative appropriations, and <u>ad hoc</u> studies.

2. Formal Coursework--Depending on the individual's background, interest, and needs, an applicant may be allowed to take courses which will strengthen his qualifications. In no case will an individual be allowed to take more than two graduate courses during [illegible]

3. Research Project Design--The culmination of the post-doctoral internship program will be the intern's design and initiation of a specific research study involving the intern's home institution.

4. Conferences--Interns will be expected to attend pre- and post-session conferences, institutional research seminars, and professional meetings of national associations, e.g., the Association for Institutional Research, Association for Higher Education, and American Educational Research Association.

Stipends: Interns will receive stipends for the nine-month period equivalent to the nine-months salary currently paid to them by their home institutions. A relocation allowance up to $500 will also be paid.

[illegible] Applications forms may be obtained from any of the IHCD representatives,[1] as follows:

> Dr. John D. Steinfeld, Director of IHCD Postdoctoral Program
> Bureau of Environmental Research
> University of Minnesota
> 1100 Washington Avenue, S.E.
> Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Completed applications should be sent to Dr. Steinfeld, Recommendations from the applicant's administrative supervisor and completed applications forms should reach the Bureau Committee by July 1, 1968. It is anticipated that time in duty, but the success of the program should warrant special efforts. Those selected for the Postdoctoral Internship Program in Environmental Research will be notified on or about July 15, 1968.

Note: Until the terms of the grant, sponsoring IHCD Committees will not be considered to have reviewed or have records which do [illegible] from the Bureau Committee. Similarly, no applications of the sponsoring IHCD Committees are not eligible for this program.

---

[1] Thomas C. Greenfield, University of Illinois; Lee Hall, Indiana University; Dana Jones, University of Iowa; Paul C. Morrison, University of Michigan; Jon L. Kemp, Michigan State University; John D. Crutchfield, University of Minnesota; Jerome Wilson, Northwestern University; W. J. Conrad, Ohio State University; Edgar Dion, Purdue University; L. Joseph Lins, University of Wisconsin; and Leonard C. Nunn, University of Chicago.

Application Form for
Postdoctoral Internship in Institutional Research
1966-67 Academic Year

A. Personal

1. Name _____ 2. Social Security No. ___-__-____
Last First Middle

3. Home Address _____ 4. Home Phone _____

5. Office Address _____ 6. Office Phone _____

7. Marital Status:
__Married; __Single; __Other Citizenship _____

8. Number of Children ____

9. Professional Experience: Please provide in chronological order, starting with your present position, the positions you have held for the past 10 years.

10. Education:

Name & Location of Institution	Dates Attended From	To	Major	Minor	Degree Received	Year Degree Granted

11. Honors or Prizes, Duties and Responsibilities:

E. Salary for 1966-67 year: $_____: 9 months; $_____: 12 months

F. Memberships and Positions in Learned and Professional Organizations:

Name of Organization	Dates of Membership	Position Held

G. Publications: Please provide bibliographic references, including co-authors, titles, etc., of all journals, magazine articles and books which you have published during the past 10 years. If more space is needed, use additional sheets.

H. Statement of Objectives: Please provide a brief statement (not more than 250 words), indicating your interest in institutional research, your strengths and weaknesses in relation to this field, and what skills and knowledge you would hope to acquire as a Post-doctoral Intern in Institutional Research during the 1966-67 academic year.

Affirmation: I agree to accept a Postdoctoral Internship if I am awarded one, and will participate fully for the full term of the 1966-67 program. I further agree that, if awarded an Internship, I will return to my home institution for at least one year after I leave the program.

Signed_____

Date _____

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
NEWS SERVICE-220 MORRILL HALL
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455
TELEPHONE: 373-2137
OCTOBER 24, 1966

For further information, contact:
NANCY PIRSIG

FEDERAL GRANT WILL TRAIN INTERNS IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

(FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE)

The University of Minnesota is serving as home base for a research training program involving 11 midwestern universities. The 11 are the members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)--the Big Ten plus the University of Chicago.

The program is postdoctoral training for interns in institutional research. It has just received a grant of $77,310 from the U.S. Office of Education's division of research training and dissemination. The funds will enable colleges and universities to train selected staff members as institutional research specialists: i.e., persons who can apply research techniques to develop better understanding and management of their institution.

Director of the project is John E. Stecklein, Director of the University's Bureau of Institutional Research. The award was made to a sub-group of the CIC, the Institutional Research Council of Eleven (IRCE), which was formed in 1960 in an effort to strengthen specialized areas of higher education.

The IRCE program provides for the training of five postdoctoral interns who, following the one-year program, will assume new responsibilities at their home institutions. All colleges in the seven-state area covered by the CIC are eligible to participate in the program. (The seven states are Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio and Wisconsin.)

Training will consist of participating in the design, analysis and interpretation of on-going research projects in the training institution's research units. Interns also will take courses and attend seminars, conferences and professional meetings of such groups as the Association for Institutional Research, the Association for Higher Education and the American Educational Research Association. Each intern will be required to design and plan the start of a specific research study involving his home school.

Dr. Stecklein pointed out that the internship program "will provide a training function that is vital to the adequate production of institutional needs and resources through the effective utilization of pertinent data."

Five of the CIC universities will serve as training units in the first year (1966-67): Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan State and Wisconsin.

Among the five interns selected for this year's program are Raymond P. Carlson, Dean of Students at Bemidji (Minn.) State College, studying at the University of Illinois; Dwain F. Petersen, Associate Professor at Mankato (Minn.) State College, studying at Michigan State University; and Professor Waldemar C. Gunther, Director of Research at Valparaiso (Ind.) University, studying at the University of Minnesota.

-U N S-

4. Program Director's Attendance

a. What was the number of instructional days for the program? 9 months (academic year)

b. What was the per cent of days the director was present? 100

5. Financial Summary--(Note: This summary does not serve as a final financial report so amounts need not be exact.)

	Budgeted	Expended or Committed
a. Trainee Support		
(1) Stipends	60,000	51,648
(2) Travel & Relocation	2,400	3,430
(3) Institutional Allowance	6,000	5,000
b. Direct Costs		
(1) Personnel (Director)	5,000	5,000
(2) Travel	2,750 & (900)*	2,877
(3) Other (Lectureship fees)	500	425
c. Indirect Costs	660	660
Total	77,310	69,040

*This $900 was allocated from the original stipend item since only five interns were accepted.